DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 102 SO 013 953

AUTHOR Burns, Robin
TITLE Legitimating Frameworks for Social Knowledge in Schools in Australia and Sweden.
PUB DATE Nov 80
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the ACIES Annual Conference (Bendigo, Australia, November, 1980).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Comparative Education; Course Content; Decision Making; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Development; Educational Practices; Educational Research; Models; Socialization; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; *Sweden

ABSTRACT

A conceptual framework for the study of education is proposed and then used in case studies which examine education and educational change in Australia and Sweden. There are three main aspects to the study of education and educational change: (1) the social-structural framework, which includes both the structure of society as a whole and of the education system itself; (2) the process of the delivery of education, which includes decision making and the pedagogical method; and (3) the content, which constitutes the knowledge generated, selected, and transmitted within the formal institution of education. Sweden and Australia have two contrasting socio-political, cultural, and educational systems. The case studies show that a strong, centralized government, with well-developed institutions, research capacities, and a unifying philosophy (as in Sweden), exercises a tight control on the generation, dissemination, and legitimation of knowledge, whereas greater flexibility exists in all three when a society and a government's institutions and values are more heterogeneous (as in Australia). (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin Burns

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED228102

LEGITIMATING FRAMEWORKS FOR SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE IN SCHOOLS IN AUSTRALIA AND SWEDEN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Robin Burns
Centre for Comparative and
International Studies in
Education
La Trobe University
Bundoora 3083

SP 013 953

Paper presented to the **ACIES** Annual Conference, Bendigo, 23-27 November 1980

LEGITIMATING FRAMEWORKS FOR SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE IN SCHOOLS IN AUSTRALIA AND SWEDEN

Robin Burns

Since formal education is supposedly for the transmission of knowledge, values and attitudes from one generation to the next, both the process of selection and the contents and manner of transmission will exhibit certain features of the society and culture within which education takes place. It is argued that underlying the structure and content of the transmission process (and also in the generation and evaluation of socially and culturally legitimated knowledge) is a particular worldview, specifically a concept of the human being, of society and culture, and of knowledge itself. These concepts, within both a spatial and a temporal frame, represent the product of human socio-cultural interaction and provide a way of organising behaviour and experience (including thought, perception, attitudes and even feelings).

As an institution, formal education is part of a culture and a society and forms part of the socialisation and enculturation process for new members of that culture and society. Publicly-financed education at least will reflect both the structural and normative guidelines which derive from the dominant culture and institutional framework of a particular society and culture. The extent to which education deviates from this framework is the outcome of factors such as the degree of socio-cultural homogeneity and hence ideological and normative homogeneity, the perceived rôle of education in society, the nature and degree of central control over institutions, and the real and perceived possibility of negotiation between the different actors and interested parties to maintain or change what goes on in education.

It is maintained that the study of education and educational change has three main aspects, following from the above. These are the social-structural framework, which includes both the structure of society as a whole ("external variables") and of the education system itself ("internal variables"), the process of the delivery of education which includes decision-making within education and its relationship to the wider institutional framework as well as the pedagogical methods involved in education, and the content, which constitutes the knowledge

generated, selected and transmitted within the formal institution of education.[1] The central proposition of the sociology of knowledge, that knowledge is socially generated and distributed,[2] provides a useful guide for the examination of the generation, selection and transmission of knowledge when taken together with the assumption that education is both largely congruent with, and provides a specific function for, society as a whole. The knowledge that is incorporated in formal education thus represents a particular selection from the social stock, both the selection and the way it is legitimated indicating some important aspects of the structure of power and authority in society and its relationships with the institutionalisation of certain forms of knowledge production and transmission. As Cowen states,

> The legitimations and forms of educational knowledge stand in reciprocal relationship to the society in which the educational knowledge is located: such legitimations reflect certain major characteristics of the society and the educational knowledge creates nationally differentiated, and in certain circumstances, sub-nationally differentiated, reality-definitions among educands.[3]

1. The structure of education

While the structural aspects of education-in-society are not independent of the normative aspects, the latter are mostly invoked to legitimate structure, process and content when any or all of these are challenged. Structure provides the framework for decision-making and influence, and the limits within which change in process and content will be effective. It also organises actors in relationship to each other, both horizontally within a level and vertically between levels. The levels can be divided into the classroom, the school, where applicable the region/state, the educational system and the educational system within society. If the classroom is the micro-level, consisting at its most basic of the interaction between a teacher and an individual learner or between any two learners, and the society is the macro-level, characteristics of the system in question will determine the weighting given to horizontal over vertical relationships in and between levels, the possibility for vertical relationships to be symmetrical or asymmetrical in terms of input to the decision-making process, the types of decisions made at each level and the extent to which decisions at one level influence or are influenced by decisions at another level. A further aspect of structure which is relevant in the consideration of the relationships between the different levels is the level at which

groups of actors are included or excluded. This affects not only the inputs and outcomes at a particular level, but insofar as the wider societal level exercises ultimate control and constraint over education, the influence of groups can at least be hypothesised to be limited by the extent to which they are excluded from the widest possible level of decision-making, depending on the extent to which that decision-making is centralised and the importance of the decisions at each level.

The greater the conformity between the educational structure and that of other institutions, the greater the possibility for homogeneity in the normative impact of education since it will reinforce and be reinforced by the other institutions. Thus, the inputs to education (actors, resources) will be selected in accordance with norms found in the wider society and culture. The outcomes, however, will be determined by the process and especially the content, both of which may be structured in order to reproduce and sort both actors and knowledge in accordance with social "needs" but, since inputs not represented in the wider society and outcomes due to the whole process of education are at least partly determined by what goes on within education, structure alone will not guarantee outcomes desired by the wider frame.

The process of socialisation - what happens to the actors - can be depicted as one in which the individual, qua individiual and qua member of a particular group within the socio-educational structure, is confirmed within the present structure, or allocated a new position, directly through ascription or indirectly through the degree of mobility permitted on the basis of achievement. If the individual's own characteristics and potentials can be regarded as the "inner limits", and the geo-political system in which s/he resides as the "outer limits", socialisation can be seen as a conflict, shifting in spatial location and over time, for the definition of the position of the individual and the extent to which s/he is a resource to be developed and is allowed to contribute her/his resources to particular institutions in society. The process of enculturation, on the other hand, though related to socialisation, is more the outcome of a conflict between individual/group values and norms and the dominant expression of these in society. The right to practise a different culture, and the consequences in terms of recognition and evaluation of individuals/groups so doing, is determined by negotiations which may have three main outcomes. These are the incorporation into the dominant or mainstream culture, marginalisation which may in extreme cases be expressed in rigid separation of groups

with subordinate groups unable to define and determine the extent of their participation in the dominant culture, or limited participation in which there may be leakage from subordinate to dominant or minimal participation through a compartmentalisation of identity and role-taking, the extent of participation being determined by the needs of the various groups as well as the barriers, both socio-political and normative, to that participation.

2. The process of education

Focussing first on the process of decision-making about education and within education, rather than the process for delivery of content, the politics and sociology of education provide some useful approaches to determining the types of decisions, the decision-makers and levels at which decisions are taken. While Scotford-Archer[4] has argued that her study of educational politics rejects correspondence theories based on an assumed correspondence between educational interactions and those in other social institutions or groups, the very fact that education exists within the institutional framework of a society, with a mandate to transmit certain types and amounts of knowledge, indicates that it is at least not independent of the wider society which provides the frameworks for the operation of education. It can be hypothesised that the negotiations between different sets of actors to determine the process of education - the structure of power and authority within education and in its relationships with other institutions - will overlap to varying degrees with the actors negotiating to determine the contents, at least forming the limits within which content can be negotiated.

Further, as Holmes points out, there is both a normative and an institutional pattern in society, as well as an environmental, demographic base.[5] Without necessarily accepting his concept of the lawfulness of each set of patterns or methods for delineating the relevant variables the distinction is useful for the analysis of the components and interrelationships within a socio-cultural system as a framework within which negotiation takes place, to maintain or change aspects of that system. Taken together with an analysis of policy and practice, which are presumed at least in the case of education to be the objects of negotiation, the process of negotiation can, as Sheehan has shown,[6] be studied within a theoretical decision-making framework which incorporates both political and administrative aspects. While he applies this predominantly to

decision-making within education, the interdependence of education within the wider framework would seem to necessitate an attempt to extend the analysis to this wider arena.

Scotford-Archer's three processes between actors/negotiators in educational decision-making (political manipulation, external transactions and internal initiation)[7] indicate that negotiation takes place on different levels. It takes the work of the so-called new sociologists of education a step further, since their focus has been on the interplay of interests for control of decision-making without analysing the sorts of decisions and the loci where these are made, thus blurring the negotiating processes and the inter-relationships and conflicts between them. While the latter have exploded the myth of a common culture as the basis for the content of education, the uncovering of interests and biasses in content says little about the way in which these interests and biasses operate to determine content.[8] By focussing on the type of decision-making process, it is possible to locate the level at which negotiation takes place. Thus, political manipulation and external transactions form part of the processes external to the education system or to a particular level within it, and both exert direct pressure on the education system as well as on the non-educational institutions and groups seen to exert more direct influence on education than the groups in question. A further distinction between such groups is whether or not they are currently part of the educational decision-making machinery, and if not, their access to those that are, as well as the extent of thier influence on them.

There is a need to distinguish between the normative and institutional aspects of the outcomes sought, as well as of the inputs made to the change process. Although the desire for policy and administrative change is based on an appeal to values, which can be considered part of the normative patterns, norms and institutions rarely show direct correspondence so it is at least hypothetically possible to achieve practical, organisational change with minimal value change, or to achieve the former from different value positions. Even at the level of policy, distinguishing between formulation, adoption and implementation, it is possible to conceive of values playing a differential rôle at each level and in different policy issues. The impetus for change itself may be only indirectly related to value shifts or conflicts, or institutional change may follow on from value change/conflict, so that lag may occur in either the

institution or the values so that there is not only conflict between value positions in the striving for change, but between institutional practice and dominant values. An outcome of such lag is asymmetry in the normative-institutional relationship and probably in the power structure at the different levels of decision-making. Thus a "problem" in the Holmesian sense exists, the outcome of which will depend not only on the negotiations for access to/control of resources but perceptions of the locus of the problem in either the normative or the institutional pattern and hence the objectives selected for negotiation.

The delivery process (pedagogy) is also a relevant factor for consideration since it is part of socialisation, representing or conflicting with interactions in the wider society. This constitutes part of the hidden curriculum. Its importance is elucidated through the distinction between micro and macro situation.[9] Processes and structures in the micro situation influence and are influenced by the macro situation, and vice versa. That influence may be asymmetrical (macro influences micro: the reverse is possible but less likely in present educational and social processes and structures) or symmetrical (interactive, including micro-micro and macro-macro). The involvement of the learners in planning, determining content and evalution, as well as the use of dialogue as a learning technique applied to certain contents, will maximise possibilities to practise new skills and apply new knowledge in real life. This is good pedagogy as it will enhance the realisation of learning aims rather than creating dissonance. Good pedagogy alone is insufficient, however, if it is not related to the individual's reality and reinforced by experience outside the immediate learning situation, so that reflection on the outcomes of action can illuminate both the contradictions at various levels of action as well as the relationships between levels.[10] Nor is process only relevant with respect to learners, for the experiences of teachers will not only affect their ability to act in the micro situation, but will also channel their use of process to greater conformity with wider societal processes or to the creation of new learning and acting approaches.

3. The content of education

Berger and Luckmann have asserted that each group member has adequate knowledge to function in that group.[11] If this is the case, then the formal and informal methods of socialisation within a group should provide all members with the knowledge. However, the light thrown

on this process by the new sociologists of education, together with even casual observation of the differential distribution of knowledge within a society where many members do not have even Berger and Luckmann's basic requirement, knowledge of which expert to consult for specialised knowledge, indicates that formal education in particular is concerned with differential transmission of knowledge. Thus, it can be posited that beyond the minimum necessary for the "proper" function of society (which may be achieved through the exclusion of some individuals and groups from knowledge and/or the devaluation of certain types of knowledge by the low evaluation of those who possess it), distribution is according to system needs, both instrumental and normative.

Haavelsrud has suggested that a way to approach the analysis of the production, transmission and evaluation of knowledge is through the underlying pirnciples of inclusion and exclusion, which vary according to major interest groupings. These principles can be examined in relationship to the basic orientation to knowledge, the premises for knowledge production, its organisation, transmission and evaluation, and the consequences in social structural and change terms. His focus is on social knowledge and on reforming, reinforcing and transcending interest groupings. Such an analysis provides a basis for an ideal-typical model for examining communication, ideas and action at the various levels within the structure of education.[12]

Taken in conjunction with Welch's delineation of a mode of content analysis in curriculum innovation, which views curriculum as one possible solution to a problem (broadly conceived as that of cultural transmission), with certain consequences following,[13] it is possible to examine the content of education in terms of the interests and the problems which are being solved through education. Assuming, with Welch, that a particular curriculum (and included here is the selection, structure and processes of curriculum knowledge) is one of many possible solutions to a certain problem, with both the problem and the solution referring to a specific set of conditions upon which they are contingent, then in Kuhnian jargon,[14] the curriculum, representing the current knowledge paradigm, can only remain dominant as long as people continue to accept its problem solutions.

It is asserted that, in addition to the interest groupings related to social steering in general and the negotiations within and between these groupings and others for the control of educational resources

and inputs, a new set of relationships is necessary to fully examine curriculum maintenance/change. These arise from the "professional knowledge-makers", those whose business is the generation of new knowledge. And while the dominant paradigms both for knowledge-generation and for applying that knowledge to society can be seen to be interest-based,[15] and interests intervene between the generation of knowledge and its selection and transmission in formal education, the whole community of scholars within a particular paradigm of a particular discipline, at least, affect the socialisation of teachers and may thus indirectly affect school knowledge. The study of the political sociology of knowledge-generation may seem a side issue from questions of control in education. But the dominant knowledge paradigms, insofar as they provide the basis for the structure, selection, transmission and evaluation of educational knowledge, socialise the educated to differing degrees into the acceptance both of particular definitions of knowledge and the knowledge-seeking process, and the evaluation of their social worth in terms of the amounts and types of this that they have been allowed to consume. Thus it is appropriate to extend Bullivant's question of the extent to which the curriculum reflects appropriate values, or even modal values if they exist and can be elucidated,[16] and ask <u>if</u> appropriate knowledge is being transmitted, <u>who</u> determines what is appropriate and how this shall be differentially distributed.

Another facet of the content of education in which the paradigm concept is useful is in the field of educational research. The types of problems selected for research, and the ways in which that is undertaken, can be delineated and their method of application to the society-education-culture relationships investigated. Research paradigms themselves will reflect, as does worldview in general, the model(s) of the human being, society and social change, and knowledge of the legitimating ideology of the research community, which may be in greater or lesser conformity to the wider socio-cultural one. The dominance of the logical-positivistic paradigm for educational and other research, at least for that research which is publicly sponsored and used for social problem-solving, provides particular problems as a basis for practice, since it cannot incorporate values as part of its propositional logic, so that the choice of problems and application of results to problem-solving has to be undertaken by recourse to outside legitimations. Therefore the use of research, and the type of research used in educational decision-making including

curriculum design, must be determined along with process and content as the outcome of negotiation, the selection being affected not only by the structure and values of society but by the extent to which and the manner in which extra-societal "scientific" influences are exerted and interpreted.

Taking a number of the foregoing issues into account, Lawton proposes a five-stage model for the selection and organisation of the curriculum.[17] While this re-focusses the attention of educators on content rather than form and process in education, the model does not deal adequately with the relationships between the different stages and it lacks a political perspective, which may be provided by an analysis such as that of Scotford-Archer, for seeing how the outcome at each stage and between stages is determined. Curriculum theory, even guided by social, philosophical and psychological-individual criteria, has on the whole avoided the critical question of the impact on the learners, and hence on society and culture, of the politics of the curriculum.

Another aspect which has been neglected is the implementation of change. Three main models exist: the centralised research, development and dissemination one, the school-based one, and a spiral one based on the concept of the teacher-as-researcher which incorporates both "expert" and "client" inputs and evaluations in the ongoing development of content, as well as horizontal contact between teachers.[18] Each is premised on a particular form of control and selection of actors in the process of content determination, as well as on different models of the nature of the person, of society and of knowledge which are to be affected by education. This leads to the almost-inevitable conclusion that the outcome of the conflict to determine the worldview/legitimating ideology, that is, the normative aspect of education and its relationships to society and culture, and to apply this power to the determination of structure, process and content, together with the power to de-legitimate alternative ideas and practice, will determine the basic features at least of the socialisation and enculturation process.

Frameworks for the legitimation of educational knowledge: centre and periphery

Frameworks for the legitimation of educational knowledge are thus forged in the wider frameworks for the legitimation of social practice. The study of the social basis and social distribution of knowledge in relationship to the various agencies involved in knowledge

transmission, the structure of power within those agencies and between them within a given political and legal unit and the social consequences of the basis and distribution, elucidates some relationships between knowledge and society in terms of structures, processes, content and outcomes.

The question of the legitimation of educational knowledge involves both socio-cultural and epistemological questions. The discernment and articulation of metascientific paradigms provides the elements of worldviews as models for socio-cultural practice. Since the different metascientific paradigms not only give rise to, or are based on, different worldviews, but different paradigms for the process of the transmission of knowledge, the discernment of the dominant paradigm in a society and of the interest-structure and decision-making processes which legitimate and activate that paradigm, provides a map of the educational system in a particular society. If the group/s who currently maintain the power to legitimate both ideology and practice can be conceived as the centre, and those attempting to bring about change as the periphery, then both the nature of negotiation and the outcome is a process of marginalisation/attempted de-marginalisation or, as Haavelsrud has depicted it, inclusion/exclusion.[19] An analysis of the centres, both structurally and normatively, and of the peripheries, in terms of their worldviews and the process of marginalisation, can thus be used not only to see the relationship between current educational inputs, processes, content and outcomes but predictively in relationship to determining the locus, direction and content of change. The analysis of legitimating frameworks, in term, indicates that education is sited at the interface between society and culture in such a way that the knowledge-generating process, its application to social problem-solving and the distribution and transmission of knowledge in society is part of the wider issue of legitimate authority, conflict and power in society.

Case studies

The foregoing is a proposal for a conceptual framework for the study of education, including educational change. Sweden and Australia present two contrasting socio-political, cultural and educational systems. This final section of the paper examines, in a very brief way, some aspects of the process of inclusion/exclusion in the structure, process and content of social knowledge in the two formal education systems.

A. Sweden

While an outsider can interpret Swedish history and culture as an unfolding of ideas and practices enabled by the relative isolation and homogeneity of the population, the late arrival of industrialisation, 170 years of peace with the outside world and in particular, 46 years of rule by the Social Democratic party, contemporary society is not without contradictions, cracks and strains. Both domestic and foreign policy, as variables external to the educational system, exhibit certain features such as the application of expert advice to rational social steering, democratic forms of representation in decision-making, a concept of social democratic solidarity with like-minded peoples and rational conflict-resolution as well a forward planning through imaginative research and future-oriented decision-making. There is a perceived linkage between social goals and educational means, so that the ways in which the practice of education has developed and the ways change is introduced show broad consonance with an approach to change in other features of social, political and economic life.[20]

In the educational reforms of the post-war period, two phases can be discerned: the first twenty years, consisting mainly of structural reform in order to democratise the structure and process of education, and based increasingly on psychometric research, and the fine-tuning phase of rolling reforms in which methods and content have been the major focus for attention. While there has been a rhetoric of increased local initiative and participation, and an uneasy duality in emphasis on individual and social goals of education, the reality has been a shifting of initiative and control of all aspects of educational change to the bureaucrats in the relevant ministries and authorities and the scientific experts on whom they rely for the research that has become central to the enactment of legislation which governs not only the procedures in education but to a significant degree, the contents as well.

There is considered to be a crisis in Swedish education today, which can be related to this shift in control and the consequent marginalisation of teachers, pupils, parents and other interested parties from the decision-making process. The crisis has three main dimensions: the failure to bring about more widespread democratisation of educational outcomes, the contradictions between the ideology of participant democracy and the reality of central control, and the unresolved society and culture wide contradiction between individual and social goals.

Despite this crisis, however, there is little sign of a departure from the present procedures for control and change. Thus, alternative viewpoints have been marginalised, giving the appearance of a high degree of structural and ideological conformity between education and other institutions with a well-defined machinery for continued dominance by the bureaucrats and selected experts. It can therefore be predicted that provided an innovation could be justified in terms of the dominant ideology, it would be implemented in a way deduced from the characteristics of the system, including not only the method of implementation but also the broad details of content.[21] The 8-year old programme for the internationalisation of education, which can be seen as an attempt to re-define the social knowledge transmitted in education, can be used as a test case for this prediction.

1. Non-educational factors. The concept of internationalisation arises out of general political concerns within Sweden and in her relations with the wider world. The notions of individual rights, welfare and democracy, non-conflictual means for the solution of disputes, and government/expert direction of policy initiatives within a stated framework of participation, are easily distinguished in the basic conceptualisation of the reasons for and content of internationalisation. Palme's vision of the future world, and the rôle of Sweden in that, gave additional coherence to his rationale for internationalisation. That it has been adopted more as a political/ideological slogan than an enthusiastic vision to be implemented arises both from the acceptance of initiative from above and the general insularity, lack of knowledge and lack of experience of most Swedes in dealing with those unlike themselves. International issues are important but remote.

2. Educational factors. While increased international content was provided for in the 1962 curriculum and given greater emphasis in the 1969 one, Palme's insistence on widescale internationalisation of education has given rise to additional efforts. In line with existing philosophy and worldview, at the school level the interpretation of internationalisation has been a broadening of the perspective on social knowledge, where this would start with the individual's own perspective and move through the family and local group to the community and beyond, and the psychological justification is predictable.[22] Two new concepts which have been drawn upon are the elimination of ethnocentrism and the development of concepts of world citizenship, although both grow logically from needs at home, on the one hand, especially in the light of attempts

to develop positive attitudes to people who are different (especially migrants and the handicapped) and Palme's vision of giving Sweden a more international orientation and profile, partly to justify diplomatic and aid policies, on the other.

Further extension of existing policies can be seen in the documents from the Internationalisation Committee of the Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities.[23] While two "motives" for internationalisation are given equal prominence, the humanitarian and the labour market, at the level of planning and implementation the latter has both fitted more closely into other changes in the higher education field (e.g. development of commercial and related skills with an international content, and modern foreign language study) and been more amenable to concretisation through administrative and financial as well as motivational means.

3. Implementation.

i. Structure: as would be expected, the relevant central administrative bodies have been responsible for setting up the machinery to implement internationalisation. At the school level research has been undertaken into the most effective means to change attitudes, and study material has been prepared and trialled. What is perhaps new is the use of other organisations in this task, especially SIDA, although they have their own well-developed concerns to increase the knowledge of Swedes about development and to establish links between domestic conditions and foreign, especially aid, policy, and they have worked through existing channels in both formal and non-formal education to organise and finance teachers' study tours, seminars and the preparation of materials. A more marginal group, but one whose rôle can be justified ideologically, is that of the Nordic Alternative Group, co-sponsored by national UN commissions and development assistance agencies in Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland and bringing UNESCO and UNICEF perspectives from development education to the internationalisation effort. Little effect has been made on undergraduate courses except through the support and development of those in accordance with the labour market motive. Thus, in general, established channels have been activated for the accelerated introduction of an area of knowledge.

ii Content: there is some debate about what constitutes an internationalised perspective, but the trends evident for example in the work of the Secretariat for Future Studies, emphasising such

concepts as global interdependence, together with new approaches to individual-community-nation-world links in civics courses, have in some senses at least been seen as co-terminous with internationalisation. Three types of content have been introduced in study material prepared under the internationalisation label: specific country studies of the Third World, focussing in line with pedagogical theory on individuals, families and villages for more ready identification and emphathy; local community studies focussing on group processes, use of local people as resources and the development of social/attitudinal skills, and attempts to combine the two both as a broadened perspective in every subject and as a logically inter-connected field of knowledge. Again, higher education has been barely touched, although SIDA in particular has been developing a programme for teachers in folk high schools and adult study circles.

iii Research, development and dissemination: in both the preparation of materials and the determination of goals and content, the rôle of the R, D and D model and of psychometric research can be seen. So far, most of the material has not got beyond the trialling stage, and despite a survey in the early 1970s which indicated both the need for new approaches to social education generally, and the willingness of pupils to learn more about the world around them, the normal slow research and evaluation process has not been accelerated for the internationalisation programme. On the one hand, this enables more in-service and general teacher preparation to take place; on the other, particularly considering more inward-looking trends in Swedish policy in the past 4 years, it could be said that the model itself is conveniently slowing down an outside initiative about which there is little real enthusiasm within the bureaucracy. It is not possible to estimate the extent to which the internationalisation directive has enabled individuals already concerned about the issues to take initiatives outside the formalised ways in which internationalisation is proceeding. Certainly the availability of research funds has assisted them so long as they can meet the criteria set down, that is, fit in to the now-articulated justification for such research. Ideological frameworks for internationalisation which have come from outside trends in development thought and development education have been espoused under the banner of internationalisation by individual researchers, student groups, and NGOs, and have more recently been put into practice in several materials development projects by SIDA. Since SIDA has not a firmly-established link with the educational R, D and D machinery, it has established its own vehicles and venues to acquaint teachers in various courses with them and it is predicted that these efforts will be successful only to the

extent that they fit in, for example, with pre-ordained curricular requirements for such materials and the general Bruner/Piaget pedagogical models for social education.

Research as a separate activity has benefitted from the release of funds through the internationalisation programme, although the establishment of SAREC to co-ordinate and stimulate research into and co-operation with developing countries, as part of Sweden's changing aid profile, was not directly linked with internationalisation. Rather, it is linked with aid policy, and that in turn with domestic policy, so that it can be envisaged that neither SAREC nor the internationalisation programme have significantly stimulated and supported development research outside the generally politically legitimated guidelines.

It is maintained that the major features of the internationalisation programme could have been predicted from a knowledge of the socio-political, economic and educational context. This has legitimated a particular interpretation of internationalised education, through the selection of those aspects which best fit the epistemological, socio-political and cultural models of man, society and social change represented by the dominant ideology. Minority interpretations of internationalisation will be progressively de-legitimised as the formal machinery, dominated by bureaucrats and experts, entrusted with the concretisation of Palme's vision, systematically assimilate, modify and implement it.

B. Australia

Although Australia has some features in common with Sweden, including demographic and economic ones, its relatively short history as a nation-state, geographical location, and political system, especially the devolution of power in the field of education to the states, provides an ideological and structural contrast to Sweden. In the domestic and foreign policy fields, where strong and consistent policy exists, there is almost a reverse of the main tenor of Swedish policy and this contrast is echoed in the worldview where even the interpretation of democracy contains elements that would be unrecognisable to a Swede. There is, in addition, a far more heterogeneous population, with both the Aboriginal ethnic minority being proportionally larger and worse off than the Sami people in Sweden, and the proportion of immigrants and those with a recent

immigrant background far higher. Despite this heterogeneity, however, the current rhetoric about a multicultural society is both confused and falls far short of a recognition of plurality of values and the legal, cultural and political implications of this.

It can at least be hypothesised that the maintenance of diversity through de-centralised structures of power and administration would lead to greater opportunities for centre-periphery exchange in the negotiation of social and educational practice. However, since diversity in fact seems to mean confusion, there has been little change or effective challenge to the dominant worldview and practice, which can conveniently be invoked to fill the gap and to successfully continue to marginalise diverse groups who are accorded only a peripheral rôle in the dominant culture and institutions.

In relationship to education, despite attempts by the Schools Commission, the Curriculum Development Centre and some state education departments to provide a coherent framework for education and its relationship to society,[24] financial and structural rather than conceptual and normative aspects are the main factors dealt with. Thus:

1. There is a lack of recognition of the differing bases and levels of discourse regarding the nature of education and the sources of ideas and analytical tools for its examination. This is not just an acknowledgement of the existence of competing theories about education, or even of competing educational research paradigms, but confusion between philosophical, sociological, psychological etc. concepts and their application to educational theorising and practical implementation.

2. There is also confusion and multiplicity in the way the theory-practice relationship is conceived. This leads, inter alia, to different models for educational change based on normative and/or instrumental considerations and sometimes pseudo-legitimated by reference to vague ideological, political or even scientific justifications. In the absence of a framework for the theorising about education and for inter-relating theory and practice in education, it is little wonder that practice, and the outcome of the struggle between interest groups for power to determine that practice, becomes the basis of the dominant mode for educational change.

3. Confusion also exists concerning the place of education, both conceptually and practically, in society and culture. Such aspects as

the legitimacy of formal schooling, its relationship to education and the rôle of either or both in the past, present and future of a particular society and culture, are hotly debated. What is often ignored is the different types of theories and the different outcomes which arise from the way in which these relationships are conceived. If formal schooling is seen as part of the wider educational process, which in turn derives its content from the knowledge and values of the culture which it is supposed to transmit, then it is culture which is the legitimate basis for determining what shall be transmitted and in what ways. Questions of how the selection is made, and who does the selecting, can be specified by reference to an epistemological framework from which prescriptive norms will be derived. If, on the other hand, society is taken as the base, then the institutional framework, and in particular institutional hierarchies and the interplay of interests in the operation of power and authority will give rise to procedures in education in which structure dominates content and ideology rather than other forms of knowledge, becomes the basis for practice including the determination of content. While debate in recent years has tended to focus around whether education is a dependent, independent or intervening variable in social change, and questions of the rôle of education in social and cultural reproduction have been raised, the relationships between society and culture and the models of man, society and change which are contained in educational theories and assumptions have been largely ignored. Skills rather than knowledge, and norms rather than values and process rather than content have formed the basis for curricula which lack a coherent framework at almost every level of consideration.

4. Where objectives and goals have been specified, neither the relationships between means and ends have been explored, as Crittenden has pointed out, nor have epistemological, normative and pragmatic derivations of these been clarified, and there is no framework or method for examining goals, means and outcomes inter-relationships, implementation and evaluation.

It is maintained that, in the absence of a coherent philosophy of education which differentiates between these aspects, and which is critically based on a concept of culture which elaborates models of man, society and change and the roles of education in this, not only will form and process continue to dominate considerations of content, but policy will be related to the fluctuations of practical politics and not to the cultural factors from which political, economic and social institutions.

5. The research paradigms within education, themselves part of the legitimated means to generate knowledge within a particular socio-cultural context, have played a rôle in the limitation of ideas about the nature of education. Empiricism in general, and psychometrics and empirical sociology in particular, have dominated research, giving rise to a practice which emphasises manipulative procedures to diagnose and remedy "deficiencies" whose definition depends on political expediency vaguely justified by values.

An aspect of the task of establishing goals and the means to translate these into practice within Australian culture which has been largely ignored is seen in the unrelated listing of aims in places like the CDC document, is the individual-society relationship. Most theories, policies and vague statements of aims list both social and individual objectives and functions for education. However, the inter-relationships are rarely specified, nor is the need to inter-relate the two recognised, leading to goals which range from the utopian through the anarchistic to the contradictory, and from which practice cannot be derived in either the normative or the management sense. The predominance of either social or individual goals in practice tends to be determined by a combination of current fashion in the dominant discipline and theoretical paradigm, and pragmatic, often ad hoc, decision-making at the political, administrative, pedagogical and even classroom levels. A cultural perspective, while providing theoretical and practical problems at the level of selection of values to form the basis and justification for aims, is nevertheless a more adequate way in which to conceive the rôle of education and of the inter-relationships between individual and social goals and outcomes. It does not deny the rôle of politics, for example, in determining practice, but provides a means for critically examining both outcomes and the bases on which policies are specified.

Australian education today is thus at a crisis point in almost every aspect, not so much because of the contradictions within and between education, society and culture but because of the ways in which a lack of frameworks within which aims and objectives can be specified affects the effectiveness of education as a critical instrument for cultural transmission and change. This can be seen in the either/or approach to aspects of social knowledge, the teaching about culture.

It can be argued that this is such a basic part of education it should infuse all teaching; the extent to which it has, and the

specific items and means for this, is seen in two emphases in the past 15 years which have been seen sequentially and competitively. In line with changing foreign policy emphases and in particular in response to pressure from the business community, a programme was launched in 1970 based on the Auchmuty Report on the promotion of the study of Asian languages and cultures. The main incentive was financial: the provision of special funds and consequent services for this, and an increase in a wide range of Asian Studies occurred in both secondary and tertiary education, although the implementation was unsystematic and varied in particular with school type. By the mid 1970s, internal policy came more to the fore, and in particular the call for multicultural education in response to a range of political pressures and humanitarian concerns, and the Galbally Report has been used as the definitive legitimating statement for a new release of funds and flurry of courses and practices. The Asian Studies grant has run out. In the eyes of politicians and practitioners alike, Asian or Multicultural studies have been seen as an either/or, and while multicultural education in particular can be seen to derive from an attempt to recognise the changing socio-cultural reality of Australian society and incorporate that into educational procedures and content, the choice between the two is made without reference to any framework for conceptualising the nature of culture and the choice of aspects for study within formal education.

Conclusion

It seems apparent from the case studies that a strong, centralised government, with well-developed institutions, research capacities and unifying philosophy exercises a tight control on the generation, dissemination and legitimation of knowledge, whereas greater flexibility exists in all three when a society and its institutions and values are more heterogeneous. When power is centralised, educational change closely follows and is legitimated by changes in policy at the centre, whereas a more diffuse situation enables change to be legitimated within the educational system without major changes in other social institutions or policies. Efforts to legitimate new knowledge, new forms of educational organisation, and new methods of acquiring and transmitting knowledge must begin by identifying both the points in the system where change is possible, and the need for and ramifications of change in the balance of power, in order to challenge existing legitimations and practices in ways which will lead to effective, rather than palliative, changes.

Notes and references

1. I have argued this more fully in R.J. Burns. The formation and legitimation of development education with particular reference to Australia and Sweden. La Trobe University, unpublished PhD thesis, 1979 and R.J. Burns. "Education, Society and Politics in Sweden". La Trobe University, Comparative Centre Monograph 2, 1980.

2. See e.g. Alvin W. Gouldner. For sociology. Renewal and critique in sociology today. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1975, especially p.104.

3. R. Cowen. "The legitimation of educational knowledge: a neglected theme in comparative research". Paper presented to the New York Academy of Science, Dec. 1975 (mimeo), p.4.

4. Margaret Scotford-Archer. "Educational politics: a model for their analysis". Paper presented to the British Comparative Education Conference, Cambridge, Sept. 1980 (mimeo)

5. Brian Holmes. Problems in Education. A Comparative Approach. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965, ch.3.

6. Barry A. Sheehan. "Comparative dimensions in educational decision-making: a comparative perspective". Paper presented to the British Comparative Education Society Conference, Cambridge, Sept. 1980 (mimeo).

7. Scotford-Archer, op.cit.

8. See A.R. Welch. "From dalliance to connubial bliss: science and higher education in the nineteenth century". University of New England, 1978 (mimeo), pp.1-2.

9. See Magnus Haavelsrud. "The hidden connection". In R. Kimura, ed. Mutual understanding of peoples and minority group education. Japan, 1976.

10. Robin Burns. "Development education and disarmament education: some comparisons and implications". UNESCO Document SS-80/CONF.401/18, Paris, 1980.

11. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann. The social construction of reality. New York, Doubleday and Co., 1967, pp.34-7.

12. Magnus Haavelsrud. "On inclusion and exclusion". Institute of Social Science, University of Tromsø, 1980 (draft, mimeo).

13. Welch, op.cit., p.3.

14. Thomas S. Kuhn. The structure of scientific revolutions. University of Chicago, International Encyclopedia of Unified Science 2(2), 1970.

15. Jürgen Habermas. Knowledge and human interests. Boston, Beacon Press, 1971 (transl. J.J. Shapiro).

16. B.M. Bullivant. "The cultural reality of curriculum development". Education News 13(9), 1972, p.15.

17. Denis Lawton. The end of the secret garden? A study in the politics of the curriculum. University of London Institute of Education, 1978.

18. Burns, "Development education ...", op.cit., p.5.

19. Haavelsrud, 1980, op.cit. For a further discussion of centre-periphery relationships and marginalisation, see Dave Hicks. "Two sides of the same coin: an exploration of the links between multicultural education and development education". New Approaches in Multiracial Education 7(2), 1979.

20. See note 1.

21. For fuller details, see Robin Burns. "Thus spake Olof Palme. The roles of politicians, bureaucrats and experts in educational reform in Sweden". Paper presented to the British Comparative Education Society Conference, Cambridge, Sept. 1980 (mimeo).

22. Inger Andersson and Lars Sundgren. "Undervisningens internationalisering". Lärarhogskolan i Umeå, 1975 (mimeo).

23. Office of the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities. Internationalising the universities. Stockholm, 1974.

24. This refers to the 1978 Karmel Report, the CDC Core Curriculum for Australian Schools (1980) and the Victorian green paper (1980), Strategies and Structures for Education in Victoria. Good critical discussions are found in J.V. D'Cruz and P.J. Sheehan, eds. The renewal of Australian schools. Melbourne, ACER, 1978 (2nd edn) and L.F. Claydon. "Common or core curriculum and culture". Paper presented at PESA (Victoria) Conference, La Trobe University, Sept. 1980 (mimeo). See also Robin Burns. "Frameworks for education for social change". Paper presented to a La Trobe University Community Week seminar, Sept. 1980 (mimeo).